UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,860	10/15/2003	Brian D. Goodman	POU920030207US1	6687

33558 7590 02/02/2011
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
Richard Lau
IPLAW DEPARTMENT / Bldg 008-2
2455 SOUTH ROAD - MS P386
POUGHKEEPSIE, NY 12601

EXAMINER	
WHIPPLE, BRIAN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2448	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/02/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

poiplaw2@us.ibm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/685,860	GOODMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	BRIAN P. WHIPPLE	2448

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 January 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-25 and 76-123* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-25 and 76-123* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :11/6/09, 1/13/10, 5/7/10, 8/31/10, 1/4/11.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19, 21-25, and 76-123 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/13/10 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19, 21-25, and 76-123 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 100-127 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6. As to claims 100-127, the presence of a storage medium alone does not necessarily exclude transitory embodiments (i.e., non-statutory embodiments) of the storage medium. For example, a carrier wave or network cable may be interpreted as temporarily storing instructions as they are transmitted from point A to point B, but would not be non-transitory (i.e., statutory) embodiments. Director Kappos's memorandum is included for reference, which directs applicants to amend "non-transitory" into claims at issue.

> The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is obliged to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during proceedings before the USPTO. See In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (during patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium (also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is silent. See MPEP 2111.01. When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal per se, the claim must be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering non-statutory subject matter. See In re Nuijten, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (transitory embodiments are not directed to statutory subject matter) and Interim Examination Instructions for Evaluating Subject Matter Eligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Aug. 24, 2009; p. 2.
>
> The USPTO recognizes that applicants may have claims directed to computer readable media that cover signals per se, which the USPTO must reject under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering both non-statutory subject matter and statutory subject matter. In an effort to assist the patent community in overcoming a rejection or potential rejection

under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in this situation, the USPTO suggests the following approach. A claim drawn to such a computer readable medium that covers both transitory and non-transitory embodiments may be amended to narrow the claim to cover only statutory embodiments to avoid a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 by adding the limitation "non-transitory" to the claim. Cf. Animals – Patentability, 1077 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 24 (April 21, 1987) (suggesting that applicants add the limitation "non-human" to a claim covering a multi-cellular organism to avoid a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101). Such an amendment would typically not raise the issue of new matter, even when the specification is silent because the broadest reasonable interpretation relies on the ordinary and customary meaning that includes signals per se. The limited situations in which such an amendment could raise issues of new matter occur, for example, when the specification does not support a non-transitory embodiment because a signal per se is the only viable embodiment such that the amended claim is impermissibly broadened beyond the supporting disclosure. See, e.g., Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp., 134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 21, 76-80, 82-86, 88-92, 95, 100-104, 106-110, 112-116, and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (Gupta), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0099777 A1, in view of Henderson et al. (Henderson), U.S. Patent No. 6,185,603 B1, further in view of Manber et al. (Manber), U.S. Patent No. 6,651,086 B1

(submitted by Applicant in the IDS filed on 6/11/08), and further in view of Bolam et al. (Bolam), U.S. Patent No. 6,154,781.

9. As to claim 1, Gupta discloses a method for creating a message at a first computer system for display on a second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0077], ln. 1-9), the method comprising the steps of:

initiating a request for a GUI message in response to an event ([0050], ln. 1-8; [0053], ln. 1-2; a request for the creation of a new message is sent to the email system in response to an event such as the user selecting a new message icon) wherein the event and the initiating of the request are external to the second computer system ([0050], ln. 1-8) wherein said message is a notification of said event ([0050], ln. 1-8; the creation of a new message is clearly an indication of an event, an event such as the user selecting an option to create a new message);

defining GUI message attributes ([0056], ln. 1-6);

defining GUI message functionality ([0055], ln. 20-25);

creating the message at the first computer system, the message comprising message content, the GUI message attributes and the GUI message functionality ([0049], ln. 1-3 and 6-12; [0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6) such that the message includes aspects of how the second computer system is to display the message content ([0056], ln. 1-6); and in response to the request, transmitting the message from the first computer system to a group of computer systems wherein the group of computer systems comprises the second computer system ([0064], ln. 1-9), each computer system in said group of computer systems extracting from said message, said attributes and functionality to instruct said each computer system how to display the user interactive GUI representation at said each computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3 and 6-12; [0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0064]).

Gupta is silent on including an alert message, said message content including instructing a desired period of time said alert message is to be displayed;

each computer system in said group of computer systems subscribing to messages from said first computer system; and

including instructions for the length of time said alert message is to be displayed, the display of the message under individual control of each computer system in said group of computer systems; and

filtering the message by a filter in each computer system in said group of computer systems, each filter for filtering keywords of interest to the respective other computer system such that the message would have to contain the keywords of interest before the respective computer system sees the message and messages not containing the keywords are blocked by said filter from being seen by said respective computer system.

However, Henderson discloses including an alert message, said message content including instructing a desired period of time said alert message is to be displayed (Col. 7, ln. 12-18 and 30-62); and

including instructions for the length of time said alert message is to be displayed (Col. 7, ln. 12-18 and 30-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta in the aforementioned manner as taught by Henderson in order to delete a message that is irrelevant after a certain point in time (Henderson: Col. 7, ln. 42-44).

Gupta and Henderson are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems subscribing to messages from said first computer system (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action mailed on 10/9/07.), the display of the message under individual control of each computer system in said group of computer systems; and

filtering the message by a filter in each computer system in said group of computer systems, each filter for filtering keywords of interest to the respective other computer system such that the message would have to contain the keywords of interest before the respective computer system sees the message and messages not containing the keywords are blocked by said filter from being seen by said respective computer system.

However, Manber discloses each computer system in said group of computer systems subscribing to messages from said first computer system (Abstract; Fig 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta and Henderson in the aforementioned manner as taught by Manber in order to connect users with similar interests so that they may have a discussion on a topic (Manber: Abstract).

Gupta, Henderson, and Manber are silent on the display of the message under individual control of each computer system in said group of computer systems; and

filtering the message by a filter in each computer system in said group of computer systems, each filter for filtering keywords of interest to the respective other computer system such that the message would have to contain the keywords of interest before the respective computer system sees the message and messages not containing the keywords are blocked by said filter from being seen by said respective computer system.

However, Bolam discloses the display of the message under individual control of each computer system in said group of computer systems (Col. 2, ln. 14-27); and

filtering the message by a filter in each computer system in said group of computer systems, each filter for filtering keywords of interest to the respective other computer system such that the message would have to contain the keywords of interest before the respective computer system sees the message and messages not containing the keywords are blocked by said filter from being seen by said respective computer system (Col. 2, ln. 27-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Henderson, and Manber in the aforementioned manner as taught by Bolam in order to allow a subscriber to filter messages in order to limit the messages displayed to the user to those of interest (Bolam: Col. 2, ln. 27-34).

10. As to claims 2 and 9, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claims 1 and 8, wherein the attributes comprise background color (Gupta: [0056], ln. 1-6).

11. As to claims 3 and 10, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claims 1 and 8, wherein the functionality for said alert message comprises removing the GUI image after a predetermined time (Henderson: Col. 7, ln. 12-18 and 30-62).

12. As to claims 4 and 11, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claims 1 and 8, wherein the content comprises text (Gupta: [0050], ln. 8-16; [0088], ln. 5-9).

13. As to claim 5, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claims 1 and 8, wherein the message further comprises routing information for any one of forwarding or acknowledging the message (Gupta: [0098], ln. 1-23).

14. As to claims 7 and 13, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claims 1 and 8, wherein the message is initiated by user action (Gupta: [0050], ln. 1-8).

15. As to claim 8, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claim 1 above.

Additionally, Gupta discloses decoding the message at the second computer system, the decoding resulting in a format suitable for processing on second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9; it is inherent that if the message is received and displayed that it was decoded into a format suitable for processing);

creating a user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9), the user interactive GUI representation comprising one or more user input functions, the user input function selectable by a user ([0079], ln. 1-5), the interactive GUI representation further comprising attributes, content and functionality defined by the extracted attributes, content and functionality of the message ([0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0077], ln. 6-9; [0078], ln. 1-7); and

displaying the user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9).

16. As to claim 14, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, further comprising identifying routing information (Gupta: [0098], ln. 5-17).

17. As to claim 15, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 14, further comprising modifying the GUI based on the routing information (Gupta: [0077], ln. 1-7).

18. As to claim 16, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, further comprising launching an application program according to attributes of the message content (Gupta: [0070], ln. 1-5; [0072], ln. 1-2 and 8-17).

19. As to claim 17, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, wherein the attributes comprise any one of inline binary data, computer program instructions, rich media content, instructions for displaying the GUI, GUI display, size or shape (Gupta: [0072], ln. 1-2 and 8-17).

20. As to claim 21, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, further comprising saving the message in a list view, the list view comprising history of messages (Gupta: Figure 5; [0055], ln. 6-10; [0070], ln. 1-5).

21. As to claims 76-80 and 82, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claims 1-5 and 7, respectively.

22. As to claims 83-86, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claims 8-11, respectively.

23. As to claims 88-92, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claims 13-17, respectively.

24. As to claim 95, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 21 above.

25. As to claims 100-104 and 106, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claims 1-5 and 7, respectively.

26. As to claims 107-110, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claims 8-11, respectively.

27. As to claims 112-116, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claims 13-17, respectively.

28. As to claim 119, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 21 above.

29. Claims 6, 12, 81, 87, 105, and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, further in view of the applicant's admitted prior art (resulting from the applicant's failure to adequately traverse the Official Notice taken in the previous Office Action mailed on 3/11/08.

30. As to claims 6 and 12, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claims 1 and 8, wherein the message is transmitted to the group by way of a pub/sub service (Bolam: Col. 2, ln. 14-34), but are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems is anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems. (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action mailed on 10/9/07.)

The applicant's admitted prior art discloses that distribution lists, forum lists, mailing lists, etc. are all well known in the art and are defined by a single mailing address to which a sender may address an email. The sender sees only the distribution list name, but then the message is subsequently distributed to all subscribers to such a list.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam by using distribution lists to keep computer systems in a group anonymous to other computer systems in the group as taught by the applicant's admitted prior art in order to ensure privacy when desired by a user.

31. As to claims 81, 87, 105, and 111, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claims 6 and 12 above.

32. Claims 18, 93, and 117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam as applied to claim 8 above, further in view of Walker et al. (Walker), U.S. Patent No. 6,286,001 B1.

33. As to claim 18, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, but are silent on the attributes identify preferred input types, the types comprising any one of keyboard, mouse, voice, biometric system, application program interface or network attached device.

However, Walker discloses the attributes identify preferred input types, the types comprising any one of keyboard, mouse, voice, biometric system, application program interface or network attached device (Col. 9, ln. 50-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam by utilizing preferred input types as taught by Walker in order to disable unapproved functions and/or enable approved functions (Walker, Col. 9, ln. 50-52) and prevent the user from accessing unauthorized data (Walker, Col. 4, ln. 5-16).

34. As to claims 93 and 117, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 18 above.

35. Claims 19, 94, and 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam as applied to claim 8 above, further in view of Microsoft Corporation (Microsoft), Internet Explorer 4.0 Accessibility, October 1997.

36. As to claim 19, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, but are silent on the GUI display is overridden by local GUI settings.

However, Microsoft discloses the GUI display is overridden by local GUI settings (Pg. 5, ln. 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam by allowing local GUI settings to override the GUI display as taught by Microsoft in order to allow the user to customize the GUI to his or her own accessibility needs (Microsoft, Pg. 2, ln. 7-10).

37. As to claims 94 and 118, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 19 above.

38. Claims 22-23, 96-97, and 120-121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam as applied to claim 8 above, further in view of Nemovicher, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0007453 A1.

39. As to claim 22, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, but are silent on the further step of pre-processing the message before the creating the GUI step.

However, Nemovicher discloses the further step of pre-processing the message before the creating the GUI step ([0020], ln. 1-4; [0058], ln. 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam by pre-processing the message before creating the GUI as taught by Nemovicher in order to ensure that recipients do not receive messages that may contain viruses (Nemovicher, [0020], ln. 17-19).

40. As to claim 23, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, Bolam, and Nemovicher disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 22, wherein pre-processing comprises virus scanning the message (Nemovicher: [0020], ln. 1-4; [0058], ln. 1-5).

41. As to claims 96 and 120, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 22 above.

42. As to claims 97 and 121, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 23 above.

43. Claims 24-25, 98-99, and 122-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam as applied to claim 8 above, further in view of McCormick et al. (McCormick), U.S. Patent No. 6,421,709 B1.

44. As to claim 24, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 8, but are silent on the further step of post-processing the message after the creating the step.

However, McCormick discloses the further step of post-processing the message after the creating the step (Col. 8, ln. 48-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Henderson, Manber, and Bolam by post-processing the message as taught by McCormick in order to teach a system to filter junk mail (McCormick, Col. 8, ln. 48-55).

45. As to claim 25, Gupta, Henderson, Manber, Bolam, and McCormick disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 24, wherein post-processing comprises generating SPAM identification heuristics (McCormick: Col. 8, ln. 48-55).

46. As to claims 98 and 122, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 24 above.

47. As to claims 99 and 123, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 25 above.

Conclusion

48. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).

49. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN P. WHIPPLE whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/Brian P Whipple/
Examiner, Art Unit 2448
1/28/11